Date of Interview: 10-2-8-04 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examinar Frederick J. Parker Art Unit Frederick J. Parker (3)	Interview Summary	10/060,458		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Frederick J. Parker. (3)	with the dammary	Examiner	Art Unit	
(2) Chastopter Duham (3)		Frederick J. Parker	1762	
Date of Interview: 10-24-04 Type: a) A Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Identification of prior art discussed: Cata et al. 485843 550 Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Selection (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS INVENCINE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW See unmary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. To response to my ingulary, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical uniter in oil enablism? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4104 is non-propose and conducted constraint to Il enablism? in the created shifterness, the Even rebutted observed a critical aspect of the inventor (i.e., other of mistry, etc.) is omitted as must be present to be proposed. It was underthood the worker-im-oil emobles in the employer for the proposity.	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
Date of Interview: 10-24-04 Type: a) A Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) A applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	(1) Frederick J. Parker.	(3)		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference colorescond [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: Identification of prior art discussed: Claim(s) discussed: Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS INVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See unmany of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. The response to me injury, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical water in oil enulsion? (2) Ex. 2 of Deckradian of 1014104 is non-provis and conflicted confrant to climit, teapt clim is state that resultant film is provided a critical aspect of the inventor (in a critical aspec	(2) Christopher Duham	(4)		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS INVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Jummary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my ingulary, Mr. Dunban called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical unter in oil enulsion? (2) Ex.2 of Declaration of 10/4104 is non-porous and completely contrary to climit, except climit state resultant Film is produce. In Dunban argued the structurant is the circuit difference, the Enr rebutted obviously a cridical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of miking, etc) is onitted a must be present to be protestable. It was underthood the worker-in-oil emulsion is the template for the provisit	Date of Interview: 10-28-04			
If Yes, brief description:	Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Below (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS INVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See immany of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my inquiry, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical unter in oil enulsion? (2) Ex.2 of Declaration of Iolyloy is non-proved and correlectly contrary to climit, except climit state the resultant film is proved. In Dunham argued the statement in the critical difference, the East rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is omitted a must be present to be protestify.	Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:			
Agreement with respect to the claims fi was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Below (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my inquiry, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in this cose, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical water in oil endsion? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of Iolyloy is non-proved and conducted contrary to clim II, except clim II states the resultant Film is proved. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the critical difference, the Ear rebutted obviously a critical aspeed of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is onitted a must be present to be protected. It was understood the worder-in-oil emobiler is the temptate for the porosity	Claim(s) discussed:			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Be(or) (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See nummary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my ingury, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issue in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agent produce critical water in oil enabling? (2) Ex.2 of Declaration of 1014104 is non-proves and completely contrary to climit, except climit state the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the critical difference, the Enr rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is onitted a must be present to be protected. It was understood the water-in-oil emobiles in the temptate for the prosity	Identification of prior art discussed: Onto other of us 5843 500			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my inquiry, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agent produce critical later in oil enulsion? (2) Ex.2 of Declaration of 1014104 is non-proves and correlately contrary to climit, except climit states the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the cardial difference, the Ener rebutted obviously a critical aspead of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil enables in the template for the porosity	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my ingury, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in This case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agant produce critical water in oil embion? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4/04 is non-porous and completely contrary to climit, except climit states the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the critical difference, the Ear rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity	Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:			
SILENTLY. (See MPEP Section 713.04). It a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY ORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my inquiry, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in this case, which boiled down to (i) is it inherent that silicone release agent produce critical nature in oil emplies? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4/04 is non-porous and completely contrary to clim 11, except clim 11 states the repulsant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the circulal difference, the Ear rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emplies is the template for the porosity	(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
inherent that silicone release agent produce critical water in oil emulsion? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4/04 is non-porous and completely contrary to clm 11, except clm 11 states the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the crucial difference, the Extrapolated obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a most be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity	THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. In response to my inquiry,			
(2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4/04 is non-porous and completely contrary to clm 11, except clm 11 states the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the crucial difference, the Ext rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity				
except clm 11 states the repulsant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the crucial difference, the Ext rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity				
is the crucial difference, the Ear rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is omitted a must be present to be parametable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity	except clm 11 states the resultant Film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement			
Invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is smitted a must be present to be potentiable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity	is the crucial difference, the Ext rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the			
It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity	invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is omitted a must be present to be particulable.			
in the porous resin layer. Mr. Dunham will request clarification from clients	It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity			
to overcome these issues, which is appreciated by the Examiner.				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Interview as Paragraph (b)
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examinor, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Tradernark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Tradernark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Tradernark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inacc which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the

The interview summary Form snail be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the Interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
 Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

- complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted, 2) an identification of the claims discussed.
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,

 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,

 (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.